UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,266	04/24/2001	Jeff Reynar	60001.0050US01	6006

27488 7590 01/11/2006		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)		SMITH, PETER J	
P.O. BOX 2903			
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 October 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-28,30 and 31* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-28,30 and 31* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 10/21/2005.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 18, 19, 21-25, 28, 30, and 31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 14,

16, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 28 are independent claims.

Third-Party Submission

3.   A third-party submission has been filed under 37 CFR 1.99 on 10/14/2005, 10/17/2005,

10/19/2005, and 10/20/2005 in the published application.

To ensure that a third-party submission does not amount to a protest or pre-grant

opposition, 37 CFR 1.99 does not permit the third party to have the right to insist that the

examiner consider any of the patents or publications submitted. Furthermore, if the submission

or part of the submission is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.99, that noncompliant submission

or part thereof will not be entered in the application file. Therefore, unless the examiner clearly

cites a patent or publication on form PTO-892, Notice of References Cited and such reference is

used in a rejection or its relevance is actually discussed during prosecution, consideration by the

examiner of any patent or publication submitted in a third-party submission cannot be presumed.

If the applicant wants to ensure that the information in a third-party submission is

considered by the examiner, the applicant should submit the information in an IDS in compliance

with 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98. An individual who has a duty to disclose under 37 CFR 1.56

should also submit any material information contained in a third-party submission to the Office

in an IDS in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98 to ensure such material information

is properly disclosed to the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 16, 18, 23-25, and 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

as being unpatentable over Pandit, US 5,859,636 patented 1/12/1999 in view of Perkowski,

US 6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999.

Regarding independent claim 1, Pandit teaches automatically receiving, in a plurality of

recognizer plug-ins, a string of text of an electronic document after the entire string of text has

been entered in the electronic document in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 lines 3-32. The

libraries of Pandit are the claimed plug-ins. Pandit teaches in each of the plurality of recognizer

plug-ins, annotating the string of text to determine a label when the string includes any of a

plurality of predetermined strings in the abstract, fig. 1-2, and col. 2 line 3 – col. 3 line 35.

Pandit teaches associating each label with the string of text in the abstract, fig. 1-2, and col. 2 –

line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches providing a list of actions that may be appropriately

performed for the label associated with the string of text, wherein the list of actions is provided

in response to a user selecting a dropdown menu associated with each label in the abstract, fig. 1-

2, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach that the list of actions associated with

the string of text are related to purchasing a product associated with the string of text. Perkowski

does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig.

4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches an applet providing a set actions related to an identified product to enable a user to purchase a related product in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been product information or transaction actions related to a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is semantically recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Pandit. Pandit teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Pandit teaches a recognizer for identifying a plurality of predetermined strings and presenting one or more actions when a predetermined string is identified in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach that the predetermined strings comprise a plurality of product names. Perkowski does teach a plurality of product identifiers that, when recognize, present a series of product related information to a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the list of actionable

items presented to the user would have been product information or transaction actions related to

a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is

directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic

meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed for product

related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is

semantically recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or

implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Pandit. Pandit

teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by

the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Pandit teaches receiving an input indicating that one of

the list of actions has been selected in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Pandit teaches in response, connecting a web browser associated with the electronic system to a

web site associated with the selected action in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line

35.

Regarding dependent claims 5, Pandit teaches wherein an identifier of the user of the

system is stored in association with each label and transmitting to the web site the identifier of

the user of the system in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Regarding dependent claims 6, Pandit teaches wherein an identifier of the user of the

system is stored in association with the actions and transmitting to the web site the identifier of

the user of the system in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Regarding independent claim 16, Pandit teaches identifying a plurality of items in an

electronic document, wherein the step of identifying the plurality of items in an electronic

document is performed by a plurality of recognizer modules on a user's computer, wherein each

of the plurality of the recognizer modules receives the plurality of items, annotates the plurality

of items to determine a label, and associates each label with the plurality of items, wherein the

plurality of items are identified as matching at least one term in a database in the abstract, fig. 1-

4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches wherein the plurality of items are already

entered in the electronic document prior to being identified in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 –

line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches connecting to a website associated with an action associated

with an label annotation in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not

teach that the database is a product database. Pandit does not teach that the selectable action is to

buy all of the identified plurality of items. Pandit does not teach sending a list of the identified

plurality of items to a website associated with the e-commerce retailer. Pandit does not teach

sending an indication to buy all of the identified plurality of items to a website associated with

the e-commerce retailer.

Perkowski teaches a product database and a list of associated websites for each product in

fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated

web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site

identifies itself to the user. Perkowski teaches an applet enabling a user to purchase products

from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been

obvious and desirable to have used the associated product information and electronic product

purchasing teachings of Perkowski to have improved Pandit so that the user would have been

able to more efficiently procure desired products from the website retailer. Pandit teaches in col.

2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Pandit teaches wherein the database is stored on the

user's computer in fig. 3 and col. 3 line 36 – col. 4 line 31. Pandit does not teach that the product

database comprises a list of product titles and product names found on the website associated

with the e-commerce retailer. Perkowski teaches a product database using individual

identification numbers to identify each of the products found on the website associated with the

e-commerce retailer in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to

have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been

obvious and desirable to have maintained a unique identification in the database for each of the

available products so that the appropriate website would have been presented to the user when

the product was identified by the recognizer module. Pandit teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that

there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention.

Regarding independent claim 23, Pandit teaches automatically receiving, in a plurality

of recognizer plug-ins, a string of text of an electronic document in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col.

2 lines 3-32. The libraries of Pandit are the claimed plug-ins. Pandit teaches in each of the

plurality of recognizer plug-ins, annotating the string of text to determine a label when the string

includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings in the abstract, fig. 1-2, and col. 2 line 3 –

col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches associating each label with the string of text in the abstract, fig. 1-

2, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches providing a list of actions that may be

appropriately performed for the label associated with the string of text in the abstract, fig. 1-2,

and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach that the list of actions associated with the

string of text are associated with shopping. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches an applet providing a set actions related to an identified product to enable a user to purchase a related product in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have associated with shopping actions related to a recognized text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed for shopping related actions and information requests over the internet when a shopping related text string is semantically recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Pandit. Pandit teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Pandit does not teach wherein the plurality of strings associated with shopping comprises variants of the strings "buy" and "sell". Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include "buy" and "sell" actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been options to buy or sell the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on buying or selling the related product. Pandit teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Pandit does not specifically teach recognizing commerce-related strings, however Pandit teaches in col. 2 lines 25-32 that there is not limit on the type of text which can be recognized by the invention. Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 1-2 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include commerce-related actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information

delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the list of actionable items

presented to the user would have been commerce-related string options pertaining to the product

identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is

directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic

meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed for product

related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string was

recognized to reduce the time the user spends on commerce actions related to the product.

Regarding independent claim 28, Pandit teaches in each of a plurality of recognizer

program modules, determining whether a string in an electronic document matches at least one

string in a recognizer database in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit

teaches if it matches, labeling the string with a semantic category, wherein the semantic category

comprises a type label in the abstract, fig. 1-2, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not

teach wherein the string is a product strong or wherein the semantic category comprises a

globally unique product identifier, wherein the globally unique product identifier uniquely

identifies the recognition event of the product string

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified

by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product

associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web

browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an

electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information

delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Pandit so that the semantic category associated

with the recognized strings presented to the user would have included both a type label and a

globally unique product identifier. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which

is directed to providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant

semantic meaning. The obvious combination of Pandit and Perkowski would have allowed the

user to have obtained an exact unique identifier for the identified product string.

Regarding dependent claims 30 and 31, Pandit teaches in each of a plurality of

recognizer program modules, determining whether a string in an electronic document matches at

least one string in a recognizer database in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Pandit teaches displaying a number of actions in association with the semantic category in the

abstract, fig. 1-2, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach sending the globally

unique product identifier to a website of a retailer or tracking the globally unique product

identifier to determine the number times it has been used.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified

by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product

associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web

browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an

electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract. This

identifier is used to identify to associated web sites what product the user is interested in.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Perkowski into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information

delivery method of Perkowski utilizing a globally unique product identification to have enhanced

Pandit so that the semantic category associated with the recognized strings presented to the user

would have displayed to the user a number of actions pertaining to a uniquely identified product.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the commerce information transaction

method of Perkowski to have uniquely transmitted information regarding the product from the

website to the user. This would have been an obvious extension of Pandit which is directed to

providing appropriate actions for a word or string of recognized significant semantic meaning. It

would have been obvious to have counted at the web site the number of times the globally

unique product identifier was used so that the retailer would have known what products are

popular and require the largest stock in inventory. The obvious combination of Pandit and

Perkowski would have allowed the user to have obtained unique commerce information for the

uniquely identified product string.

6.   **Claims 7-15 and 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Pandit, US 5,859,636 patented 1/12/1999 in view of Perkowski, US

6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999 and Jovicic et al. (hereinafter "Jovicic"), US 5,855,007.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Pandit teaches receiving an input indicating that one of

the list of actions has been selected in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Pandit teaches in response to the selection implementing the selected action in the abstract, fig.

1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach in response to identifying the user

providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in

fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated

web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site

identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so

that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col.

7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a discount offer to a user in response to identifying the user in

fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of

coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a discount offer to the user in

response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would have increased the chance

that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web site hits. The increase in

traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would have been obvious and

desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have presented the user with

discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to the web site.

Regarding dependent claims 8-11, Pandit teaches receiving an input indicating that one

of the list of actions has been selected in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Pandit teaches in response to the selection implementing the selected action in the abstract, fig.

1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach in response to identifying the user

providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in

fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated

web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site

identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so

that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col.

7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a coupon to an identified user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col.

8 line 17. Jovicic teaches that the coupon comprises an identification, discount value, and a

begin and end date in fig. 3 and col. 6 line 49 – col. 7 line 40. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-

20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon

discount offer to the user in response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would

have increased the chance that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web

site hits. The increase in traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would

have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have

presented the user with discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to

the web site.

Regarding independent claim 12, Pandit teaches using each of a plurality of recognizer

modules to determine a number of strings in a database that match at least one string in an

electronic document in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches

labeling the matched strings in the electronic document associated with each of the plurality of

recognizer modules and providing a plurality of actions in association with each recognized

string in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach

determining whether the number of recognized strings exceeds a predetermined minimum and if

so, providing a coupon as one of the plurality of actions. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a coupon discount offer to a user in response to identifying the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon discount offer to the user if the user was selecting a predetermined minimum number of product strings so that the user may be rewarded by the merchant for giving a high volume of business to the merchant. The offer would have increased the chance that the user would have selected that merchant's products again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Pandit does not teach that the strings in the database comprise names of consumer products. Perkowski does teach storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. The combination would have enabled the user to more easily access information related to identified consumer products.

Regarding independent claim 14, Pandit teaches using each of a plurality of recognizer modules to determine in an electronic document strings that match at least one string in a database in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches applying a

semantic category associated with each of the plurality of recognizer modules to each of the

matches strings in the electronic document, wherein the semantic category comprises a type label

identifying the type of the matches string in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line

35. Pandit does not teach an affiliate number identification, wherein the affiliate number

identification is associated with the user of the electronic document. Perkowski does teach

storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items

in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches rewarding an identified visiting

user with a discount offer in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski

and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and

desirable to have rewarded the identified user for referring business to a web site so that the user

would be encouraged to referred business to the web site again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Pandit teaches determining that an action associated

with the semantic category has been selected in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3

line 35. Pandit does not teach sending the affiliate number identification to the website. Jovicic

teaches sending a user identification number to a website so that the website may provide the

user with a discount offer. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined

Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been

obvious and desirable to have identified the user to the website so that the website could have

produced and presented the user with the appropriate reward discount.

Regarding independent claim 19, Pandit teaches cross-referencing a text string name

with a type label database to determine whether the name matches at least one entry in the type

label database, wherein the step of cross-referencing the text string name with a type label

database to determine whether the product name matches at least one entry in the type label

database is performed by a plurality of recognizer modules on the computer in the abstract, fig.

1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches labeling the name with a type label

associated with each of the plurality of recognizers if it matches, cross-referencing the type label

with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label, and listing the

matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number

of different actions in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not

teach that the string name is a product name. Pandit does not teach that the name is transmitted

to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified

by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a

user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email

because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Pandit teaches wherein cross-referencing each type

label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match each type label and listing the

matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number

of different actions are performed by an action module on the computer in the abstract, fig. 1-4,

and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35.

Regarding independent claim 22, Pandit teaches a plurality of type label associated with a name in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit teaches cross-referencing each type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match each type label, and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions in the abstract, fig. 1-4, and col. 2 – line 3 col. 3 line 35. Pandit does not teach that the string name is a product name. Pandit does not teach that the name and associated type label are transmitted to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Pandit to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-19, 21-25, 28, 30, and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The Examiner has found the prior art reference of Pandit, which teaches the use of a plurality of recognizer plug-ins as well as semantically labeling a recognized string of text and providing a list of actions in response to user selection of the accented and semantically labeled string of text. Therefore, the Examiner replaces Beauregard with Pandit.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Perry et al., "Discovering Similar Resources by Content Part-Linking", Proceedings

of the Sixth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, published by

ACM Press 1997, pages 317-324.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
1/6/2006

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/8/2006